

THE  
THIRD and FOURTH  
OF THE  
CONTROVERSIAL LETTERS:  
OR THE  
GRAND  
Controversie

Concerning

The pretended Temporal Authority of POPES  
over the whole Earth, and the true Sovereign  
of KINGS within their own respective Kingdoms,

Between two English Gentlemen,

The one of the Church of ENGLAND,

The other of the Church of ROME.

---

L O N D O N:

Printed for *Henry Brome* and *Benjamin Tooke*, at  
the Gun and Ship in *St. Pauls Church-*  
*Yard.* MDCLXXIII.

# Comptrolverie

That the said Comptrolverie of the  
of the whole said, and the true  
of the said Comptrolverie their own  
the said Comptrolverie

Between the said Comptrolverie

The one of the Comptrolverie of the

The other of the Comptrolverie of the

A. N. 1707

Witness the said Comptrolverie of the

the said Comptrolverie of the

1707

## FRIEND,

**F**OR all the thanks I owe you, and all the Complements 'twere fit I made you, take this acknowledgment, that you have answered beyond my expectation ; and this assurance, that I will consider very seriously what you say, and make such use of it, that you shall have cause to think your labour not unprofitably spent. But yet I cannot but complain of the secrecie which you enjoy me. I for my part am so well satisfied of your way of writing, that I cannot but think others will be so too, and that this shiness of yours is injurious both to your self and the World ; and because unjust commands are not to be obey'd, let me tell you frankly I mean not to confine your Papers to my closet. They shall be seen if it please God, by more Eyes then mine ; but yet not to fall absolutely out with you, I will divide stakes, and so communicate what you write, that there shall be no suspicion of the Writer. This I promise you very faithfully, and to do it with more exactness, lest your name should be discovered, I engage my self to conceal my own. Then if *John a nokes* get all the praise from you, the fault be upon your own Head. For the rest to deal plainly with you, I find my self I know not how. Things will not settle with me, and though out of the mouth of a good Protestant, I believe what you say would have past good reason; yet when I reflect you are a Papist, that is, if you will pardon my Freedom, of a crafty insinuating Generation, I have still a kind of grumbling.

This Papist marrs all ; and though I think my self as free from prejudice as other men, I find t'wil not do. I can not but fear being trapan'd. You have I must confess said many things very well, and more then I thought

A

you

you had been allow'd to say, but you are reserv'd still. 'Tis true you give Reasons for your reservedness, which I can not answer; but whether it be that my plain nature would have every thing as plain as my self, or that curiosity be like Love where too much reason is thought blameable. I could wish in this occasion you had us'd less Reason and more Freedom. Speak out the whole truth, man, and be a good Protestant; otherwise own the whole Falshood, and be a Papist of the first magnitude. I fear your half Catholicks are in as bad a Case as *Montaltos* half Sinners, who shall be damn'd for not sinning enough. For my part if I would be a Papist, I would be a Papist to purpose. Hang this motly Religion, this half *Rome*, half *Geneva* Faith, which gets a man neither credit nor security. I would be as good a Catholick as *Bellarmin* for his heart if I would be one; and if I thought your Catholick Faith would save me, I would take order mine should be Catholick enough sure, and never boggle at any thing should be offer'd me. But to leave Jeasting, let me tell you, though I know not how you will relish the Complement you write so well that you must needs write again. I may possibly hereafter give you more trouble upon this Subject, when these fluttering Fancies of mine are settled into a steady Judgement. I know not how satisfactory your Answer may prove when I have fully examin'd it: If it do not, I reserve my self the liberty to tell you so; and in the mean time conceive you could not chuse a more useful Argument, then this of the Popes power. He was a man famous for wisdom who, as I find cited in one of your own Authors, *was long troubled that some clear explication of the Papal Authority had not hitherto been made by some publick or definitive Sentente; and this both that those Princes, who acknowledge it, may be secure from the fear and suspicions of continual Treasons and Attempts of Assassins; and those Princes who do not acknowledge it, and yet desire to think favourably of their Subjects, may certainly know how far they may rely upon their fidelity in temporal matters, who differ from them*



them in what concerns their Conscience. Consider besides what confusion, what Wars and Bloodshed we find in History upon the contests betwixt the Spiritual and Temporal Power. People distracted betwixt the fear of making Shipwrack of their Faith or their Fortunes, know not how to avoid either Heresy on the one side, or Rebellion on the other. If the World were once well inform'd of the just bounds of those two Powers, and knew wherein they consisted, and how far they extended, such contests would either not happen, or if they did People would readily know which part to take. However it be, pray satisfy me at least in this particulars. The substance of your Answer consists in this, that the Doctrines I objected belong not to your Faith or Church. But does not this belong to your Faith, That the Pope is the Vicar of Christ upon Earth? I think you would not take him for a Catholick who should deny it. Now if Christ gave to the Pope the Power he had himself, since He without doubt had all both Spiritual and Temporal Power, how can you avoid being oblig'd, and that by an Article of your Faith, to acknowledge that the Pope likewise has all manner of Power, and may justly and lawfully do all those things which your Letter calls the exorbitant fancies of private men. This Friend exceeds the bounds of probable opinions, and intrenches strongly on your Faith. Wherefore you shall not deny either my friendship or importunity an Answer to it. But answer so, if possibly you can, that these doubts or umbrages, or what you perhaps may find a better name for, then I can give a reason of, may trouble me no longer. Will you permit me to deal plainly with you? I suspect you have said more then you are allow'd to say, and more then I should be allow'd to hold if I were of your Communion. The Jews were not more zealous to make Profelytes then you are; and what know I but you may have a design upon me, and say more what you think may

induce me to think favourably of your Religion, then what your Religion gives you warrant to say. Let me therefore intreat you to say nothing but what a good Catholick may unrepurvably say, and what I may be secure shall not be he disallow'd by your Church. And since I can promise you no other fruit of your labour, for I do not think you hope in earnest to make a Profelyte of me, accept the assurance I give you, that you shall at least firmly bind to your Service,

*Yours, &c.*

*Friend*

## FRIEND,

**Y**OU know the power of your friendship over me, and you make use of it. For ought I see mine is just the case of handsome-handed *Tom Fool*, whom that praise betray'd to so much labour, that he complain'd his dexterity had almost crippled him. Pray God my easiness, or your importunity give me not one day more cause of complaint than he had. But since you will not be deny'd, 'tis best to obey you without more ado. For your unquietness I could laugh at it, if its deeper root did not give me too much cause of grief. As sincere as you are you are prejudic'd Friend, and this unquietness of yours is the struggling betwixt reason, which you plainly see, and a passion so secret that 'tis hid even from your self, which hinders you from entertaining freely what you see. Not but that I know your candour well, and am enough perswaded you are not conscious of opposing reason wilfully, and would be your Compurgator of sin against the Holy Ghost. But thus it happens: Ever since the change of Religion, and the bad attempts of some Catholicks in the days of Queen *Elizabeth*, heightned by the horrid *Powder Treason*, it has been perhaps the direction of the State, however the employment of Pulpits, to give bad impressions of Catholicks and their Religion. And this has been done so long, and so universally, and so vehemently, that since you find the effect of it, I may reasonably judge there is none who has not his share, and who has not found an *Idea* of Catholicks more according to what they have been represented than what they are. As the Nature and circumstances of men are different, and some are fram'd to a sweet uprightness, others to an unwayward crookedness. Again some converse much with good Catholicks, some with bad ones, some with none,



none, and who have no other knowledge of them, but as they hear of strange animals in *Afric* or the *Indies*, so men are differently affected towards them: But I believe there is none who has not more or less of the bad *Idea* so much endeavour'd to be fixt upon them, and that no hearty Protestant can hear things said to the advantage of Catholicks or their Religion without that unquietness at least which you find in your self. It were to be wisht, and perhaps expected from the Charity of *Pulpits*, that the example of that wise and merciful King, against whom that Treason was plotted might have been followed, and the Innocent distinguisht from the Guilty. But whatever might or should have been, we see what is done, and you find the effect in your self, whereof that you may not think reason the cause, consider a little that while we pass generally for ignorant stupid people, led blindly into all the follies to which our blinder Guides our Priests conduct us, you object craft and subtlety to me. Reason, Friend, is more uniform and more of a piece, and objects not so crossly. For what you say of our Jewish zeal of gaining Profelytes, I must avow to you I am of St. Pauls mind, and with *non tantum se, sed etiam omnes qui audiunt hodie fieri tales qualis ego sum, exceptis vinculis his*. I am taught to love my neighbour as my self, & because I am satisfy'd the way in which I am is the way to Heaven, I wish every body would chuse it. But if you think me a dangerous person for this, you must think Reason a dangerous thing, which he that fears to be trapan'd, let me tell you is more trapan'd by his own fears. You talk pleasantly of half Catholicks, and motly Religion, but I think you expect no answer, and need not be put in mind, that Religion as sacred as it is cannot hinder men from using their weak apprehensions, and disorderly fancies, (and irregular deductions as well upon it as every thing else; and he that shall take all that for Faith, which every even faithful man offers him, may too truly say *inopem me copia fecit*, and find perhaps at last that too much Religion has left him none at all. For the new trouble with which you threaten me,



me, I hope the more you examine my answer, the less cause of exception you will find against it. Nevertheless if you do prove dissatisfy'd, I will endeavour, when I know why, to satisfy you as well as I can.

The noble Person cite was unquestionably a wise man, and his saying is a wise saying, and I am of his mind, and with such an Authentick definition made in this matter with all my heart. But Friend, I am no Pope to make one, and though I am perswaded an Authentick definition of truth might produce very good effects, I fear an unseasonable dispute might do as much harm. Those two Powers like two boundless Seas, have sometimes struggled together, and in their unresistable Waves buried multitudes of unhappy People. We may bless God we live in a calm; disputes might raise the billows again, and who knows when they would be laid. I could speak with Freedom to you, but since you talk of communicating what I say to others, consider that one will mistake ignorantly, another pervert wilfully, a third deduce rashly, and in a matter of this consequence where our duty required by the Law of God is concern'd, all interpose eagerly, and the most ignorant being still the most forward and full of noise; the great good you fancy by setting bounds to the two Powers, would prove clamour, and bustle, and inextricable confusion, and if any miscarriage happen all will be imputed to the Author, who as innocent as he may otherwise be, can never yet acquit himself of meddling with what he has nothing to do. No Friend, let us preserve the Majesty of Supream Powers in an awful distance, and submit to them with the reverence of a quiet obedience, and not make them cheap by unseasonable disputes. Princes and Bishops are both sacred, let what belongs to them be so too, and not toucht without the excuse of necessity or obligation of duty. *But People should know how to behave themselves when the two Powers are at odds.* For my part I conceive this is a Case which may safely be left to Gods providence, and that those who do amiss, sin more by Passion then Ignorance. Let a man truly mean,

mean to do well, and bring an upright Conscience to he Action, and I believe he will not want as much knowledge as is necessary for him. This I see, that God being Author of both Powers, it is not possible they should enterfare, but by an abuse of the one, and that abuse will be visible enough; and when the case happens those who do not want honesty will not miscarry for want of knowledge. In the mean time I should be very sorry to see the case happen, I will not contribute towards it so much as even to mention it. Obedience is the duty which God and my condition require from me, and in the performance of that I will endeavour to be found unblamable, and leave disputing to those who value the praise of a witty or subtle man, above that of a faithful and quiet subject. Besides though I might possibly hit of something more then is usually say'd on the argument, which in my Opinion uses to be treated lamely enough, yet I take it much to exceed the sphere of my ability. In two words it is a question which I neither could sufficiently handle if I would, nor would if I could. But for your second question, since it trenches as you say upon Faith, and we are taught to be ready to give satisfaction to any who demands an account of the hope in us, I shall obey the Apostle and you to my power. You tie me nevertheless to pretty severe conditions, for what is there, or can there be so plain which mistaking zeal will not reprove? or what other remedy can I bring to settle your quietness then Reason, which yet I conceive to be the very thing which causes it? The onely expedient I can find to speak as you would have me is to say nothing at all, I mean of my self, farther then to deliver, upon occasion, my sense of what others say, but answer your objection in the words of such men of whom you may be secure they will run no hazard of reproof from our Church; and if your Reason can as well rectifie your self as their Authority will justifie them, I hope you may at last be satisfy'd. Remember then if you please that I take not upon me to determine dogmatically what is true,

true, and what false, but only to acquaint you what may  
by a Catholick unrepovably be said. Peradventure I  
have no reason to be displeas'd with the bargain, for dog-  
matizing being so much out of Fashion in this age, it is  
a great deal more easie as well as more fashionable to  
deliver what other men say to the point, then to handle  
and conclude the point it self. To show more of this I need

But to your Difficulty. *The Pope, say you, is acknowl-  
edg'd by Catholics to be the Vicar of Christ on Earth; and*  
I acknowledge that he is so. From this you frame such  
an Argument; *What power Christ had, the Pope has; Christ*  
*had all power, therefore the Pope has so too, and this is your*  
*Article of our Faith.* Before I answer let me intreat you  
to consider what work it would make if it were apply'd  
to Princes instead of Popes, which I think it may as well  
be. For if the Pope be the Vicar of Christ on Earth,  
Princes are the Vicars of God on Earth, and that I think  
is as good and reaches as far. And: if this Vicarship im-  
port an power to dispose of Kingdomes, why will not  
their Vicarship import the power of the Keys? and why  
may not he, who purely upon the score of Vicarship,  
comes to the Pope for a Title to a Kingdom, as well go  
to his King for Remission of his sins. If the Pope must  
be said to have the temporal Power as well as spiritual,  
because Vicar includes both, I see not how Princes can  
be deny'd to have the spiritual, since they have the tempo-  
ral, and are Vicars as well as he. This Doctrine would  
make brave work, and introduce a very pleasant Refor-  
mation into the World. But I forget that I am to say  
nothing of myself. I must therefore undertake a need-  
less labour, and shew from other men that Princes are  
the Vicars of God; and though the unanimous consent  
of every body might well excuse me, for none that I  
ever heard of either doubts they are so, or boggles to call  
them so when the phrase comes in their way, yet I must  
not break my bargain. Let us then consider what this  
word Vicar signifies, and in such plenty, or rather such  
a multitude, for I wish the plenty were as great as the



number as we have amongst us. We cannot sure be ignorant what a Vicar is. We see he is one who supplies the place of another, who not able for other respects, to attend to his proper employment, delivers it over to be executed by him whom we call his Vicar. Kings we see govern the World, and the Government of the World being the proper work of Providence, they do the business which properly belongs to God. But the nature of God being of that unsociable excellence, that we are not able to bear the immediate Rays of divine brightness, and converse with him whose Face none can see and live, our nature requires he should do this by such substitutes to whom we may address our selves, and have recourse for what we need. Since Kings then supply the place of God, or do that which he should do, and which he truly does by them, they want nothing to the perfect notion of his Vicars but this, that they be appointed and impow'rd by God for that end: With this difference notwithstanding, that Vicars are necessary for other men, from the imperfection of their natures, who make them, because they cannot attend to two employments at once; but are necessary for God from the superexcelling perfection of his nature, and imperfection of ours, which cannot bear an immediate converse with him. Now what they are immediately substituted by God to govern the World under him or in his place, since tis not likewise to be deny'd, I hope a few Authorities will serve to prove. And yet I cannot tell whether that hasty word *Immediately* will down with all. For some Divines put this difference betwixt the Spiritual and Temporal Power, that the first is immediately from God; the second by mediation of the People, subjecting themselves by way of Election, Succession, or such other means by which Governments are either introduc'd or establish'd. And for my part, though I were not ty'd from dogmatizing, *certains verities* is a thing from which I have much aversion, especially in a question which I conceive of an extraordinary importance. For whether the power be from God immediately or

mediately



mediately, so it be from God, I conceive it extends as far and is as much to be obey'd. *Saul and David* were immediately appointed by God, and yet I think as much obedience was due to *Solomon* as either of them, and that *St. Peter's* Successour, whether *Clement* or whoever else, was as much Pope as he. And if election made the power mediate, we see Popes are not Popes till they be elected. There are indeed who by this mediation understand a reserve in the people to reassume in certain cases the power which they have given: But this I must needs think very abominable, and shall not stick to say whoever reproves me for it, is himself more reprobable. *St. Paul* has taught there is no power but from God; so I believe: and if any think they have found better Masters of Faith, I for my part mean to stick to those which Christ has given me. But let us see what is said by those whom no Catholick I suppose will reprove. The Council of *Paris* speaks methinks to purpose, when it says: *No King must think his Kingdom left him by his Progenitors, but truly and humbly believe 'twas given him by God: And that earthly Kingdoms are not given by men, but God, the Prophet Daniel testifies, Dan. 4. 14. & 5. 25. & Hierom. 27. 5. But to them who think their Kingdoms given them by Succession from their Ancestors, and not rather by God, agrees that which God reproves by the Prophet, They have reigned, but not by me; they have been Princes, and I knew them not. — Wherefore whoever Reigns temporally over other men, let him believe his Kingdom was given him not by men, but by God. St. Austin de Civit. Dei; Let us not attribute the power of giving Kingdoms and Empires to any but the true God. Tertullian; They (Emperours) know who gave them the Empire; They know 'twas he who made them men, and gave them souls. They are sensible 'twas God alone, under whose power alone they are, second to him, and after him first before all men. Again; From thence is the Emperour from whence the man before he was Emperour, from thence the power from whence the spirit or breath. I am not good*

L. 2. c. 3.

Osee 8. 4.

L. 3. l. 21.

Apoleget. adv.  
Gent. c. 30.

as Ciceron; but methinks 'tis hard to make that power  
mediate, which is not from Ancestors and Succession, not  
from men; but from God alone. More refin'd wits  
perhaps may make it hang together that Kings have their  
power from God alone, and from something else too, and  
that their power is mediate, in which none interposes but  
himself; and prove a gift from the people of that which  
God himself gives, as if his power were under Age, and  
could not make a valid donation without them: and when  
they have done such fine things, we are still just where  
we were; for 'tis acknowledg'd of all hands, even by those  
who least favour the temporal power, that it is from God;  
and if it be so, those who have it from him are his Vicars.  
But yet you shall not take my word even for so much.  
He was a Vicar of Christ himself, who speaks thus to  
the Emperour: *The brest of your clemency is Sacrarium, the  
sacred depository of publick felicity; that by you whom God  
has commanded to preside as his Vicar on Earth.* And be-  
fore him *Elutherius* in an Epistle to King *Lucius* our,  
and I think the Worlds first Christian King, preserved in  
our Antiquities, tells him 'twas needless to send him the Ro-  
man Laws, which the King desir'd, but wishes him to take  
the Law of God, and the advice of his own Nation, and  
frame such as were proper for his Country, as being himself  
the Vicar of God. After him another uses these terms to the  
Emperour: *Although you similitudinem geras, which I  
know not how otherwise to English then represent the per-  
son, or are the Vicar of the Emperour Christ himself.* The  
same phrase is found in Pope *Hermisdas*. *St. Ambrose* speaks  
plainly: *Let them know they are not free, but under the pow-  
er which is from God, for they are subject to their Prince, qui  
vicem Dei agit, who is the Vicar of God, as to God himself.*  
*S. Tho. of Aquin.* If he be Author of the work attributed to  
him, says a King is oblig'd with all care and diligence to  
look after Religion, not onely because he is a man, but be-  
cause he is a Lord and a King, and *Dei vices gerit, is the  
Vicar of God, on whom he chiefly depends.* To omit *Ni-  
colaus de Lyra, Evarandinus*, and more then a Letter  
would

Anast. 2:  
Ep. un.

Steph. G. ap.  
Baron. an. 889.  
n. II.

In Ep. ad Rom.  
c. 13.

De Regim.  
Princ. l. 2.

would hold, or you have patience to read (for I think you are furnisht with a sufficient stock of that vertue, if you can forgive the folly of saying so much as I have done, which seems to me not much wiser then to go about seriously to prove there is such a place as *Jamaica*; or has been such a Man as *Harry* the 8th.) I shall onely adde the Authority of the Roman Pontifical Printed at *Rome* 1595. where the Prayer appointed for the Consecration of Kings ends thus, *That you may glory without end with our Redeemer Jesus Christ, cujus nomen vicemq; gestare crederis, whose name you bear, and whose Vicar you are.* This being so, consider now what a pleasant Argument you have light upon, by which Kings may as well absolve Penitents, and confer Sacraments, as the Pope dispose of Kingdoms. Notwithstanding let us look a little nearer upon it. Christ, say you, gave all the power he had; He had all, both *Spiritual* and *Temporal*, therefore the Pope must have it too. If you will not be too hasty in your censure, but delay it till I have time to explain my meaning, I will answer you a Catholick may be a very good Catholick, and believe all a Catholick is bound to believe, and yet believe never a one of those two Propositions. Not that I mean to be guilty of the blasphemy of denying to the Son of God all power in Heaven and Earth, but that Son of God being man too, I do not know a Catholick is bound to believe that man, purely as man, was a temporal King. But of this more by and by when your second Proposition comes into play; in the mean time let us consider the first, viz. That Christ gave to the Pope in *St. Peter* all the power he had himself. Pray how does this appear? 'tis included say you in this, that he is his Vicar. I beseech you consider again, for I cannot readily think of an inference which seems to me more wild, and more palpably contradicted by the open course of things with which we daily converse. A Judge represents the Kings Person, a Constable does it, all Officers both Civil and Military supply his place in their several employments. Can every  
one



one of these therefore do as much as the King? Can a General coyn money, or a Judge call a Parliament; or a Constable make War and Peace? We see their several Powers are bounded by their several Commissions, and the priviledge of representing his person gives them no more power then he is pleas'd to confer upon them. How can it be otherwise with the Pope? He indeed is the Vicar of Christ, and represents his person, and so the Judge does the Kings, but what power he has we are to learn from his Commission, not his Title.

Let us now consider what a good Catholick may say to this point. And first I believe no man can reprove him if he say he finds no temporal power included in any Commission recorded in Scripture, Tradition or the Fathers; and if he refuse to believe more then he finds there, I think none will reprove him for that neither. In Scripture we find Saint *Peter* commissioned to teach, to baptize, to feed the Flock, to confirm his Brethren; we find the Keys of Heaven promis'd and given him, and what those Keys signifie we find there declared to be this, that what he should bind or loose on Earth should be bound or loos'd in Heaven. But of deposing Kings, or disposing of Kingdoms, we read no word. That his Commission extends only to Spirituall, is a thing so notoriously known, and universally receiv'd amongst Catholicks; none denying it but some Canonists who meddle *ultra crepidam*, and a few Divines who handle their *crepidam* unskillfully and follow them, that to be serious and earnest in the proof of it, is a labour as little needful and perhaps less pardonable then that which I have newly ended, of shewing Princes to be Vicars of God. However because I am to say nothing of my self, hear what others say. *Gelasius* speaks very clearly: *Fuerant hæc ante adventum Christi, &c.* Before the coming of Christ, figuratively, and remaining yet in carnal actions, some were both Kings and Priests, as the H. History delivers of Melchizedeck. Which thing too, the Devil, striving always with a Tyrannical Pride, to usurp to himself those things which be-  
long

De Anath.  
Virg.

le.



long to divine Worship, has imitated amongst his Followers; so that amongst Pagans the same men have been Emperours and chief Bishops; but when we were once come to the true King and Bishop (Christ) neither has the Emperour any longer assum'd the name of a Bishop, nor the Bishop the regal dignity. For although his Members, that is of a true King and Bishop, are magnificently said according to the participation of his nature, to have assum'd both in a sacred generosity, that the Regality and Priesthood may subsist together; yet Christ mindful of the frailty of humane nature, tempering with a glorious Dispensation what might conduce to the salvation of his People, has so distinguish'd the Offices of both Powers by proper Actions and distinct Dignities, desirous his Followers should be sav'd by wholesome Humility, and not again betray'd by humane Pride, both that Christian Emperours should need Bishops for eternal life, and Bishops in the conduct of the temporal things should use the Imperial Laws, that the spiritual action might be distant from carnal assaults, and he whom militat Deo is a Souldier of Gods, should not embroil himself with secular business; and on the other side, he who is entangled in secular business should not preside over divine matters; both that the modesty of both degrees might be provided for, lest he who had both should be puffed up, and a convenient profession be particularly fitted to the qualities of the Actions. This man was a Vicar of Christ himself, and you see he is so far from thinking his Commission extends to temporal things, that he plainly teaches Christ distinguish them, and left the spiritual Power so alone to him, that for temporal Laws he was to be beholding to the Emperour. I might peradventure have run the hazard of reproof, if I had said that to joyn those two Powers is an Artifice of the Devil, but I suppose that saying will not be reprov'd in so antient and so holy a Pope. Symmachus succeeded as to his Chair, being the next Pope but one after him, so to his Doctrine. You, says he to the Emperour, receive Baptism from the Bishop, the Sacraments, Penance, desire their Prayers, their Benediction; lastly you administer humane; he dispenses divine things to you. Greg. the 2d. Ep. 13. to the

the Emperour Leo; As the Bishop has no power to look into the Palace, and meddle with regal dignity, dignitates regales deferendi; so neither has the Emperour to look into the Church, &c. — Bishops are therefore set over Churches, abstaining from the business of the Commonwealth, that Princes in like manner may abstain from Ecclesiastical matters, Leo 4. 2. q. 7. c. Nos si incompetenter. It is to be noted that there are two Persons by which the World is governed, the Royal and the Sacerdotal. As Kings preside in the affairs of the World, so Priests in what belongs to God. It belongs to Kings to inflict corporal, to Priests to inflict spiritual punishment. — He (Judex) carries the Sword for punishment of the bad and praise of the good: these (Priests) have the Keys to exclude the excommunicate, and reconcile the penitent. Nicolas 3d. C. Inter hæc 32. q. 2. The holy Church of God is not govern'd by worldly Laws, she has no Sword but the Spiritual, with which she doth not kill but quicken. Adrian the first in the Council of Franckfort seems to me with one little word to explain very well the Commission given to St. Peter: Peter, sayd he, in reward of his confession was made Porter of Heaven, and had power to bind and loose; so much we already know, 'tis recorded in Scripture, but what was it he could bind and loose? Souls says the Pope. These Popes understood and us'd their power as well as most of their Successours, and they knew nothing of Temporal power, but confin'd what was given them to spiritual and divine things, and care of the Soul. And that this too is the sense of the Church, I think will appear by the Prayer us'd on the Feast of St. Peters Chair, which antiently ran thus; O God, who by giving the Keys of Heaven, hast deliver'd to Peter the Pontifical dignity of binding and loosing Souls. This last word Souls is left out of the latter Editions, I suppose to render the Prayer more conformable to the expressions of Scripture, and peradventure to keep more close to antiquity, of which they are very tenacious at Rome: for *Platina* in the Life of Leo 4th. delivers the rude draught of this Prayer, whence 'tis likely the Prayer was taken, with-

without that word: But the meaning with the word and without is the same; Words may alter, but the Churches sense alters not. But let us hear some other of the Fathers. *Hosius* Bishop of *Corduba*, who presided in the Council of *Nice*, and was counted in his time the Father of Bishops, writes thus to the Emperour *Constantius*:

*God has committed the Empire to you, and entrusted us with* *Vid. Athan. Ep. ad Solicita-*  
*what belongs to the Church: and as he who looks upon your Em-* *Ep. ad Solicita-*  
*pire with envious Eyes contradicts the divine Ordination;* *7105.*

so do you take heed that by drawing affairs of the Church to you, you incur a great crime. It is written, give what is Cæsars to Cæsar, and what is Gods to God. Wherefore neither is it lawful for us to take an Empire on Earth, neither does the Power of Sacrifices and holy things belong to you.

*S. Jo. Chrysoft. hom 4. in verb. Isaïæ; Bodies are committed to Kings, Souls to Priests.*— He has material, those

spiritual Arms. *S. Hierom. in cap. 16. Mat. The Spiritual Key extends not it self to Temporals without Arrogance.*

*Theophylac. upon John 21. Our Lord makes Peter not a Prince, not a King, but commands him to be a Pastour.*—

*Feed, says he, not Kill, &c. S. Anselm. upon Mat. 26.*

*There are secular Officers by whom Temporal things, and Spiritual Officers by whom Spiritual things are managed. Wherefore the material Sword is given to carnal, and the Spiritual to Spiritual Officers; and as what belongs to the Church is not proper for Kings, so neither ought the Bishop to meddle with what belongs to Kings. Which because Peter (who represents spiritual men) did, when he us'd the material Sword, and cut off our Servants Ears, he deserv'd to be reprehended by our Lord. Hugo de san. Victor. de sacr. fid. l. 2. p. 3.*

*c. 4. Earthly Power has the King for Heads: Spiritual Power the Pope. Earthly things, and all ordained for earthly Life, belong to the power of the King; Spiritual things, and all belonging to Spiritual life, to the Pope. Again l. 2. p. 2. c. 3. It is given to the faithful Christian Laity to possess Temporals, to the Clergy onely Spirituals are committed.*

*St. Bernard speaks thus to the Pope: Your Power is not* *De confid. l. 1.*  
*in Possessions, but in Crimes; and for these, not for them,* *c. 6.*



*you have received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. Consider Hago's onely Spirituals, and St. Bernards not for Possessions of Temporals, and judge whether a Catholick is like to be reproved for not extending the Popes power beyond Spirituals. And in his 2d. Book speaking of Temporals; Be it, says he, that you may some other way challenge these things, but not by the right of Apostleship, for he (Peter) could not give what he had not himself, what he had that he gave: the care, as I said, over Churches. Rupertus Abbas upon these words nor a Rod, Mat. 10. speaks thus; But now there are two Rods, one of the Kings of Gentiles, another of the Disciples of Christ: The Rod of the Kings of Gentiles is the Rod of Dominion, the Rod of the Disciples of Christ is the Rod of Direction, the Rod of Pastoral duty solicitously watching over the cure of Souls: The Rod which is of Dominion, is not granted to the Ministers of the Gospel of Peace, and that is forbidden here, nor a Rod, &c. Cardinal Damianus L. 4. Ep. 9. ad Olderic. Episc. Firman. Between the Kingdom and Priesthood the proper Offices of each are distinguished, that the King may make use of the Arms of the World, and the Priest be girt with the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. — If any Object that Pope Leo engaged himself often in War, who nevertheless is a Saint; I say what I think, that neither Peter obtained the Apostolical Principality because he denied Christ, nor David deserved the Oracle of Prophecy because defiled another mans Bed. Schoolmen as they speak more plainly, are a little more severe. Almain de Authorit. Eccles. c. 2. puts this difference betwixt Ecclesiastical and Lay power, that by this onely corporeal punishment is inflicted, by other Spiritual precisely. Joan. de Parisius c. 10. de potest. Reg. & Pap. Granting that Christ had temporal authority and power, yet gave it not to Peter. c. 15. Answering the Objection from Quodcunq; solveritis, &c. I answer with Chrysostom and Ravanus, by this is not understood any power given but Spiritual to absolve from the bond of Sins: and it were foolish to understand a power given to absolve from the Bond of Debt. Again c. 14. To Peter was  
given*



given spiritual power onely to remit sins, nor can he do any thing in temporals, but in foro conscientiae. Aegid. Rom. Q. de utraq; potestat. art. 3. It is to be understood that Christ had a threefold power over bodies, souls, and temporal goods. The first he us'd by curing infirmities, &c. The second, viz. Spiritual, he both us'd and delegated as much as is necessary and expedient for the good of Souls. The third He neither us'd nor gave, but rather forbade both to Peter and the other Apostles as is said: And concludes; In the Commission given to Peter his Vicar, we read not temporal, but onely spiritual power committed to him. I will give Thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, he said not, and Dominion over worldly things: Wherefore he presently adds, as explicating himself to mean onely spiritual power, Whatever you shall bind, &c. Ambros. Catharin. upon Rom. 13. That the Pope is Vicar of Christ, is nothing to purpose to make us believe he has power given him to rule all the World in temporals. It rather perswades us such power was not given him, because Christ refus'd it, and as he was man had it not in the World; for after the Resurrection 'twas said all power is given me, &c. But in this World he was subject to secular powers. Wherefore he left the Pope Vicar of that Kingdom which was given him by his Father while he liv'd on Earth; namely, the spiritual Kingdom over his Sheep, &c. Otherwise if he be the Vicar of Christ absolutely according to all the power which Christ had, he should have power over Angels and the Blessed, which is ridiculous. And again, These powers are different from one another, and no man can usurp either at his pleasure; and to think and teach otherwise is most seditious and most horrible. Anton. de Rosell. de Protestat. Imp. & Pap. p. 1. c. 38. Whence I conclude 'tis Herefie and Madness, to say that the universal Administration of Temporals is or can be in the Pope. Greg. Haimbarg. de prim. Pap. Whence it appears 'tis a fable, and invention that is writ in the Decretals, that Popes have the plenitude of power given them, and such a Dominion that they are over Kings and Princes in Temporals. They are smart fellowes, these Schoolmen, and speak home, and

yet are good Catholicks for all that, and acknowledg'd to be so; neither are they otherwise reprov'd or reprovable, then as Scholars take the freedom to censure one another. Mean time since a Catholick may unreprouably hold that the two powers were distinguish'd by Christ, and joyn'd by the Devil, the temporal committed to Princes, and the spiritual to Bishops, who if they be Souldiers of God are not to meddle with secular business; that while Bishops dispense divine, Princes are to administer humane things; that to the Clergy belong onely spirituals, and the Popes power has nothing to do with possessions; that dominion is forbidden him, and onely the Rod of direction granted, &c. I hope you may quiet your fears, and not suspect I shall either be disown'd or reprov'd by my Church, if upon the security of so much Authority I deny your first Proposition, and affirm the Popes Vicarship is confin'd to spirituals, and that it hinders not Princes from being Gods Vicars as well as himself; who, if they manage all their trust, are accountable onely to him, second to whom they are, and except whom they have none above them, I mean in their own kind. Onely I would not have you boggle at this, that the Pope is not every where expressly nam'd. For though the Order of Government require that the Head should have more power then an inferior Member, as the Commission of a General must be larger then that of a private Captain; yet I think none will doubt but the power of the Pope and the rest of the Clergy is all of the same kind, and the more which belongs to him as Head of the Church, signifies more of the same sort of actions, not power of another nature. But because I am to say nothing of my self, let St. *Leo* tell you this and more in a Sermon inserted into the Churches Office on the Feast of St. *Peters* Chair at *Antioch*, where speaking of the Confession of St. *Peter*, and the promise made him upon it: *The force indeed, says he, of this power past into the other Apostles, and the Constitution of this Decree (of the keys) descended to all the Princes of the Church; but 'tis*

not without cause that what is intimated to all is commanded to one. For this is therefore particularly entrusted to Peter, because the example of Peter is propos'd to all the Governors of the Church. And so much to the first Proposition, which though I have abstained from treating dogmatically, yet I have said, or rather shew'd you that others say what may abundantly quiet your fears, and that a Catholick who confines the Popes power onely to spirituals, is so far from contradicting my principle receiv'd amongst Catholicks, that he has the warrant of great, I had almost said all Authority on this side, at least so much that is not well consistent with Catholick principles to oppose it. But I pray mistake me not, for though I have said nothing of my self, yet I would not be misinterpreted so much as to have alledg'd ought which might be thought to question any, not onely spiritual, but even temporal power which may justly belong to the Church, and which when it does, she may without doubt justly use. But 'tis one thing to have power by agreement of men, and another by Commission from Christ, and I would say no more then St. Bernard has said before me, that however such things may belong to the Church, yet not by right of Apostleship. Your Argument assum'd that a Vicar had the same power with him whose Vicar he is; what I have alledg'd was only to answer that, and as I am not oblig'd, so I meant not to go farther.

What I shall adde in examination of your second Proposition you will perceive is more to satisfy your Friendship then your Argument; for whether Christ had temporal Dominion or no, if he gave it not to the Pope, the Pope is never the near, and your Argument sufficiently clear'd. Notwithstanding since I would not give you cause to complain I neglect any thing you propos'd, let us consider how far this is true, that Christ had all temporal as well as spiritual power. But, Friend, I hope your feud to formalities is abated, for I must tell you beforehand, there is no discoursing on this subject without distinguishing the God from the Man. You know in  
Christ



Christ the distinct properties of both Natures were so united, that they both made but one Sacred Person, to which person nothing can be deny'd which can with truth be affirm'd of God, and none I think will be so madly blasphemous to question the absolute Sovereignty and Omnipotent power of God over all things. But the same person was man too, and 'tis from that formality the Pope claims; for suppose 'tis no less impiety to affirm, that what belongs to the Divine Nature is not communicable to any to whom that Nature is not communicated, then 'tis to deny of the Divine Nature that which truly belongs to it. And this *Bellarmin* well understood when he argues thus: *Christ as man while he liv'd on Earth neither had nor would have Dominion merely temporal over any Province or Town: But the Pope is the Vicar of Christ, and represents Christ to us as he was while he liv'd amongst men; Wherefore the Pope as Christ's Vicar, and consequently as Pope, has not Dominion merely temporal over any Province or Town.* Speaking now of Christ precisely as Man, those who attribute temporal power to him, and make him a secular King, go one of these two ways. They either alledge right of Succession by descent from *David*, or a particular grant from God the Father, in whose power it being to dispose of all Kingdoms, they affirm he has transfer'd this Right upon his Son as Man. Of these two the first is hard to prove, and in my opinion signifies nothing when 'tis prov'd. The descent indeed of Christ from, and that by two several branches is recorded in the Gospel; but descent gives a tittle to none but the nearest of the descent, and that Christ was the nearest, is so far from appearing, that I know not how it possibly should. 'Tis true, that *Solomon* and his Posterity Reigned to *Jeconias*, but of him the Prophet, *Hier. 22. 30.* Foretold there should not be of his seed a man who should sit upon the Throne of *David*, and have power longer in *Juda*: So that the Succession of that Regal Line of *David* seems ended in him. 'Tis true *Zedechias* or *Mathanias* Reigned 11 years after him, who was not

of

*De Rom. Pont.*  
*l. 5. c. 4.*

of his seed, for he was his Uncle; but from him to *Aristobulus* of the Race of the *Machabees*, who first re-assum'd the Regal Diadem, there was not any King at all amongst the Jews. That *Nathan* or any of his Posterity either Reign'd or had right to Reign nothing appears, and much less that Christ was the nearest of the descendants from either that or the other branch. In so much darkness I think 'tis evident there can be no clear title. However I conceive another thing is clear, which, even supposing that Christ were next in descent to *David*, would quite take away all Title to his Kingdom, and that is, that in his time the Kingdom was legally and justly translated from the Family of *David*, to the *Asmoneans*. For certainly to affirm that the *Machabees*, and their Successors, who with excellent vertue recover'd the lost Scepter, and settled it in their own Family, were all Intruders and Usurpers and Tyrants, would be a wild and preposterous assertion, and such an one as would unsettle all the translations of Empires which concur in the course of History, whereof few perhaps have been made with greater vertue or more justice. What King can be secure of his Title if the *Asmoneans* were no Rightful King? And if they were, descent from *David* gives Christ no more title to the Throne of *David*, then Signior *Paleologa* (far be all irreverence from the comparison) has to the Empire of *Greece*, or *Goodman Rannage* to the Crown of *England*. A title therefore by descent seems very hard to prove, but though it were prov'd, I think there is so little got by the bargain, that it might have been e'en as well let alone. For right to the Kingdom of *David* is but right to the Kingdom of *David*, and I suppose the Pope will not agree to have his Authority confin'd to the *Ghetto* at *Rome* and be put to the trouble of Assembling the dispers'd *Jews*, that he may have over whom to Reign, and wringing out the ancient Kingdom of *David* from the present Possessors, that he may have where to Reign. He knows well enough the strength and stability of long possession, and I dare say will not change his spiritual title at *Rome*

for

for the best and fairest temporal title which can be made him to *Hiernusalem*, and where else the right of *David* can give him any interest, 'tis hard to imagine.

The other Plea is a Grant from his Father, who may undoubtedly dispose of Kingdoms, and every thing else as he pleases. But his usual way of giving Kingdoms is to put those to whom he gives them into actual possession by Election, Succession, the sword or other secondary means. To give bare titles without other fruit is a course not suitable to the method of his proceeding. Lawyers indeed have invented a distinction betwixt the Dominion and *usus fructus* of a thing, and the distinction is useful here below, but I suspect distinctions are strangers in Heaven, and that plain dealing providence deals little in *Chican*. However it be, being resolv'd not to penerate into the depth of the question my self, I shall onely observe to you what people say on both sides, and leave you to judge. This short reflexion by the way I suppose I may irreprovably make, that if the Father made any such grant, the Son was not ignorant of it. And if he knew such power was given him, and yet refused to use it, I perceive not how he will be excus'd from the blame of not doing what belong'd to him to do. A King certainly is as much oblig'd to govern, as a Subject to obey: and since 'tis manifest blasphemy to say Christ was deficient in any point of duty, this in reference to my dulness is unavoidable; Christ did not perform the duty of a temporal King, therefore he was no temporal King. But these are onely my thoughts by the by, what people say on both sides is this. Those who would have Christ a temporal King, alledge in proof these places of Scripture which speak of his power in general, and expressly apply the name of King to him in particular. Such as Heb. 1. 2. *Whom he made Heir of all things, by whom also he made the Worlds*, Heb. 2. 7. *Thou hast Crowned him with honour and glory, and set him over all the works of thy hands. For in that he subjected all things, he left nothing not subject to him*, 1 Cor. 5. 24. *When he shall have*



have evacuated all Principality and Power and Vertue,  
 Mat. 28. 18. All power is given me in Heaven and in  
 Earth, Jo. 23. 3. Knowing that the Father had given  
 all things into his hands, Jo. 5. 22. For the Father  
 judges no man, but has given all judgment to the Son; he has  
 given him power to judge, because he is the son of man, Apoc.  
 17. 14. They shall fight with the Lamb, and the Lamb  
 shall overcome them, because he is Lord of Lords, and King  
 of Kings. And again 19. 16. And he has written in his gar-  
 ment and on his thigh, King of Kings and Lord of Lords.  
 Isa. 33. 22. The Lord is our King, he will save us. Psal.  
 2. 6. I am made by him a King over Sion his holy hill, and  
 a great many more of the same nature. These say they and  
 the like places, are both plain in themselves, and plainly  
 expounded of a temporal regal power by the Fathers.  
 To which purpose they bring Theophylact expounding that  
 to the Heb. whom he made Heir of all things; that is,  
 made Lord of the whole World; but how did he make him  
 Lord? Namely as man, in the second Psalm he speaks to  
 him, Ask of me and I will give thee the Gentiles for thy In-  
 heritance. And St. Anselm upon the same place; Whom  
 the Father appointed according to the humanity the immu-  
 table Heir of all things; that is, possessor of all creatures.  
 And Haymo upon the same place too; God the Father  
 appointed his Son Heir of all things, that is of the whole  
 World or all creatures, not onely according to the Divinity in  
 which he is coeternal to his Father, and coequal in the Om-  
 nipotence of the Deity, and in which he eternally possesses  
 all things with his Father; but rather according to the hu-  
 manity assum'd by the word he is appointed Lord and Heir over  
 all creatures, as God the Father promis'd him saying, Ask of  
 me, &c. And the Son himself rising from the dead speaks  
 thus in the person of the humanity; All power is given me in  
 Heaven and in Earth. Eusebius Emislenus; He who  
 according to his Divinity had alwayes with the Father and  
 Holy Ghost power over all things; now also according to his  
 humanity has receiv'd power over all things as Man. He who  
 lately suffer'd let him Rule both in Heaven and in Earth,

L. 2. Cont.  
PAYMEN.

and be believed the God and Lord, not of the Jews onely but of all Nations. Optatus against the Donatists: Why do you break such a promise, and confine to a kind of Prison the vast extent of Kingdoms? why do you strive to hinder so much goodness? why are you against our Saviours merits? Permit the Son to enjoy what was granted, permit the Father to perform what he promised. Why do you set bounds, and fix Limits, when the whole Earth was promised by the Father? There is not any thing in any part of the Earth which seems exempt from his Possession. The whole Earth with its Nations were given him. These and the like places are the chief supports of the affirmative opinion; for I omit their Reasons, not onely because a man who were strongly bent upon it, may invent specious pretexts almost for any thing, and they seem to me no other, but because I take questions of Faith not properly to belong to the decision of meer Reason. I mean in this manner, that People should rashly determine by their ill grounded reasonings, what is fitting or not fitting for God to do. We are to learn of our Fathers and the Church what he has done, and not by Airy speculations determine what he should do. If this Doctrine hath been delivered to our Fore-Fathers, we shall sure enough receive it from them; but if we do not, it will hardly belong to Faith, even though it could be proved true. In the mean time, those who maintain the negative, bring particular Answers to all these places, the substance whereof devolves to this, that the Kingdom and Regal power attributed to Christ in the Scripture, is to be understood of his Spiritual Kingdom the Church, unless where his person is spoken of as comprehending the divine as well as humane nature, in which Cases, Regal power, and all that can be attributed to God, may justly be affirmed of him. 'Twere to write a Book instead of a Letter to dilate them all particularly, and when all is done, this is the substance: But then on their side they alleadge Scripture and Fathers, in my opinion much more convincing. And first they affirm the question is expressly and plainly

plainly decided by Christ himself, *Joh. 18. 36.* When being askt by *Pilate* if he were a King, he denies it not, but withal affirms his Kingdom is not of this World: And methinks people might take his word, and cease to dispute of what he so plainly determined, for I cannot think otherwise but this Answer meets the difficulty in the Face, and so reserves whether the right of omnipotence or spiritaal Regality, as very positively to exclude Temporal power. They alledge again *Luke 12. 14. Who has made me Judge or Divider betwixt you?* Our blessed Saviour was moved by one who heard him, and perhaps believed in him, to cause one Brother to divide an inheritance with the other. And he not onely refuses the motion, but says in a phrase usual in Scripture of denying by interrogation, it was a matter in which he had nothing to do. Now if Christ were truly a Temporal King, 'tis hard to imagine how rendring Justice to his Subjects, who demanded it at his hands, and determining emergent Controversies, in which the very Office of a King does in a great measure consist, should not belong to him. I have nothing to do with Possessions, and I am no Temporal King, to seem equivalent. They alledge besides, *Joh. 6. 15.* where Christ perceiving the multitude were resolved to make him King, fled from them and hid himself. Put him to have received temporal Dominion over all the World from his Father, and 'twill be hard to unriddle why he used it not in this occasion. His Subjects more disposed to obey him, they were willing, they were forward to do their parts; what can be said why he did not do his, and govern them? I said before, and I cannot but repeat it, 'Tis as much the duty of a King to govern, as of Subjects to be governed; and I cannot for my life imagine any other reason, why he should refuse to govern, then this, that he was no temporal King. If it may be permitted me to speak freely, this position of temporal regal Power in Christ seems to me to include both nonsense and blasphemy. For Nonsense it is to put a Power in



him to no purpose, an useles Metaphysical *potentia* never reduced into Act; and blasphemy it is to say he was deficient in his duty: and how that position will get clear of either of these absurdities, I can by no means understand. Other places of Scripture they bring, but these are the most material. Now because a Catholick cannot be a Catholick, who maintains a position directly contrary to Scripture, for neither he nor his position would be endured, those of the other side have invented several Senses which they give to the places alledged; and though those Senses seem to me full of Nonsense, yet I cannot but commend in the Authors that they chuse rather to contradict common Sense then Scripture. But do you Judge; *My Kingdom is not of this World*, that is, say they, *'tis not by way of Election or Succession, nor governed as Worldly Kingdomes are by Treasuries, and Officers, and Armies.* To omit that a Kingdom of this World, though received and governed another way then usually Kingdomes are, is still a Kingdom of this World, for the World is the World let it be goverued how twil; this seems to me to say that the Kingdom of Christ is no Temporal Kingdom. For temporal Kingdoms can not sub sist nor go on without such things; and he that says his Kingdom had them not, says plainly his Kingdom was such a Kingdom which needed none of those things. Which in other words I think is to say it was not a Temporal Kingdom. Again, say they, *the Kingdom of Christ is therefore said not to be of this world, because at that time most worldly Kingdomes were got by injustice, and governed by wicked and idolatrous Laws, and such the Kingdom of Christ was not.* But pray, the Kingdomes now a days establisht with Justice and governed with equity, are they not Kingdomes of this World? Or did Constantine forfeit his worldly Empire, by abolishing those Idolatrous Laws, and making better in their places? Strange Interpretors of Scripture! Who would make worldly Kingdoms inconsistent with ver-

tue, and Kings cease to be Kings when they turn good men and most deserve to be so. Besides, if the world were divided into Kingdomes, however unjustly got and wickedly governed, t'was yet divided into Kingdomes, and what Room was then left for Christ? Would they have him a King, and give him no Kingdom, or a Kingdom no where? Farther what can be said why he did not establish his just Kingdom in the place of those wicked ones, and take so much injustice out of the World? I think nothing but only this, that his Kingdom was of another nature, made to take away injustice from all, Dominion from none. I say nothing of the impertinence of alledging injustice in the beginning of Empires, a position which would shake the Foundations of the most settled Governments, and leave few Princes secure of their Titles. A third answer is, that his Kingdom is not of this World, because *not onely of this World, but of Heaven and Earth and all Creatures*, as if this World and more were not this World. Besides it mistakes the question too, which is not of the extent of his Power, to which every Body knows that every thing is subject, but of the manner, whether besides the omnipotence of his divine nature, and the spiritual Regality of his humane, there were in him a Temporal power, and he were appointed by his Father as *Saul* to judge the People, and go before them, and fight their battles. This is what the Scripture tells us People expect from their Kings, and who speaks not to this speaks not to the question. Farther they say that Christs Kingdom is not of this world, because *worldly Kingdomes are over Bodies, his over Souls; worldly Kingdomes require obedience to a Temporal Prince, his knowledge of, and obedience to the Prince of Heaven: worldly Kingdomes are extinguisht by death, or War &c. his is perpetual and immortal, &c.* And this is to say as plain as can be said, that 'tis spiritual and not temporal. For Temporal Kingdoms are over Bodies, and

1 Reg. 21. 8.

and if Christs Kingdom be only over Souls, 'tis not temporal; again 'tis not temporal if it can not be extinguish't, for no temporal thing is immortal. Farther to contra-distinguish the temporal Prince from the Prince of Heaven is directly to yield the question and change sides. That prejudice should be so strange a blindness, and men think to answer by saying the very same with their Adversaries! To that of the division of the Inheritance, they answer that *what Christ refus'd was to be made Arbitrator betwixt the two Brethren*. But besides that, to understand the place of Arbitration seems a little violent; for Arbitration requires the Consent of both Parties, and there appears nothing but the complaint of one against the injustice of the other. His answer imports, that meddling with Inheritances was a thing with which he had nothing to do, and that, whether he thought fit or no to become an Arbitrator, temporal Matters belonged not to him. Again they say, his signify'd he *was no Ordinary Judge, whose Duty and Obligation it was to determine civil Controversies, but that his Jurisdiction was Voluntary and Arbitrary*: And if this be not to say he was not a temporal King I understand nothing; for a temporal King, is oblig'd by his Office to do Justice and determine civil Controversies, and his power is not Voluntary and Arbitrary, but Coactive and Obligatory.

Thirdly, They answer, that *Christ meant his judicial power was not by humane concession*; as if he could not have done the business as well by Authority from Heaven as from Earth, and had not been that way more empowered, and more oblig'd to perform his duty.

Fourthly, That *Christ came not into the World to judge temporal things, though he had full power so to do*; which is just what the other side says, that he was not sent, or empower'd by his Father for that purpose, though as God he might do what he pleas'd. What a pleasant folly this unresolv'dness to maintain a thing is, which makes people



ple bring for answer the very position they oppose.

Lastly, He is said to *have refus'd dividing the Inheritance, because Division is the work of the Devil.* Division of hearts indeed is so, but division of possessions is a work of peace, and a necessary means to Union of hearts; 'tis a command from God, and a duty in Kings.

This is chiefly what is said on both sides; you will judge as you see cause. I for my part believe none better acquainted with the truth than Christ himself, and I mean to take his word and believe his Kingdom is not of this World, and I care not who knows it. If I mistake his meaning, and that the Kingdom which he says is not of this World, prove yet to be a worldly Kingdom, I shall at least have the comfort to err in very good Company, and good Company you know is a thing I love sufficiently.

St. Cyril of Alexan. speaking of the Hyacinth in the Mytre of Aaron; *The Hyacinth* says he, *signifies Heaven; remember therefore Christ saying my Kingdom is not of this World, for Christ is not an Earthly, but a Heavenly King, and has all creatures under his feet,* St. John Chrysostom; *Christ, says he, acknowledges himself a King, but a Heavenly King; which elsewhere answering Pilate, he says more clearly, my Kingdom is not of this World.* And in another place, *Scripture knows two Kingdoms, one of Adoption and Familiarity, another of Creation by the Law of Making and Creating he is King of all, Jews, Pagans, Devils, Adversaries; by familiarity and care (he is King) of the Faithful, and those who willingly commit and subject themselves to him. This Kingdom too is said to have a beginning; for of this in the second Psalm, Ask, says he, of me and I will give thee the Gentiles for thy Inheritance: and to his Disciples, all power is given me by my Father.* St. Hierom. shews the prophecy concerning *Ieconias* was not contrary to the promise of the Angel, because, says he, *Jeremy speaks of a temporal and carnal Kingdom, Gabriel of a spiritual and eternal*

*De ador. in spir. l. 11.*

*Hom. 87. in Mat.*

*Hom. 39. in 1 Cor. 15.*

*In Hierom. c. 22.*

Tr. 115. in  
Joan.

Tr. 25. in  
Joan.

eternal one. St. Auffer; Hear you Jews and Gentiles, hear Circumcision, Prepuce hear, hear all you Earthly Kingdoms, I hinder not your Dominion in this World, my Kingdom is not of this World. And again, What would you more? Come to the Kingdom which is not of this World; come by believing, and be not cruel by fearing. The prophecy says of God the Father, but I am appointed by him a King over Sion his holy hill: But that Sion, and that Hill is not of this World. For what is his Kingdom, but those who believe in him? To whom he says, you are not of this World, as I am not of this World, &c. Again, It is plainly said of the Kingdom of Christ, not according to that in the beginning, where God the Word was with God, for there none ever doubted but he is King for all Ages, but according to the Assumption of Humanity, and Sacrament of Mediatour, and Incarnation of a Virgin, that it shall have no end; where the Angel speaking to Mary says, and he will give him the Kingdom of David his Father, and he shall Reign in the House of Jacob for ever. — But this Kingdom in the House of Jacob, and on the Throne of David, can it be understood otherwise then in the Church, and that People which is his Kingdom? of which also the Apostle says, when he shall have deliver'd up his Kingdom to God the Father, that is, brought his Saints to the Contemplation of his Father. And L. 17. de Civit. Dei C. 7. Speaking of the passage betwixt Saul and Samuel, when Saul tore the Cloak of Samuel: He represented figuratively the people of Israel, which people were to lose their Kingdom, our Lord Jesus Christ by the New Testament being to Reign, not carnally, but spiritually. And what says he, was not he a King who fear'd to be made a King? plainly he was, but not such a King as could be made by men, but such a King as could give Kingdoms to men. — He came now not to Reign now, as he will in that Kingdom of which we say, let thy Kingdom come. He alwaies Reigns with his Father, according as he is the Son of God, the Word of God, the Word by which all things are made. But the Prophets foretold his Kingdom also according to this, that  
he

he was made Man, and made those who believe Christians. For there shall be a Kingdom of Christians, which is now a gathering, now making, is now burying with the blood of Christ. This Kingdom will one day be manifest, when the brightness of the Saints will be manifested after the judgment by him made, which judgment he said before that the Son of Man should make: Of which Kingdom also the Apostle saith, when he shall have deliver'd up his Kingdom to God his Father: Whence also he says himself, Come you blessed of my Father, possesse the Kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the World. But his Disciples and the multitude believing in him, thought he came now to Reign. This is for them to take and make him King, to prevent the time which he kept secret to himself to declare seasonably at the end of the World. St. Hilary; *In Psal. 2.* This therefore is the King set over Sion the holy hill of God, declaring the Command of the Lord, not over that hill of the Earthly City, that deplor'd, and homicide, and parricide Jerusalem but that Jerusalem, which is in Heaven; that which is our Mother, the City of the great King, whose Inhabitants, as I conceive, those at this day are who rose in the Passion of our Lord. St. Bernard; That our Lord *Hom. 4. sup.* Jesus was descended from David, no man doubts: But I *Mis.* ask how God gave him the Throne of his Father David when he Reign'd not in Jerusalem; nay, consented not to the multitude which would have made him King; besides protested to the face of Pilate, my Kingdom is not of this world. — But we know a Jerusalem was signified different from that which is now, and in which David Reign'd, much more Noble and more Rich, and this I conceive was meant here, by a manner of speech usual in Scripture, where the Sign is often put for the thing signify'd. God did then give him the Seat of David his Father, when he was by him made King over Sion his holy hill. And he seems more plainly to declare what Kingdom it is of which he speaks, by this that he says, not in Sion, but over Sion. For peradventure it was therefore said above, that David Reign'd in  
E Sion,



Sion, but his Kingdom is over Sion, of whom it was said to David, of your seed I will place upon your Seat. Of whom it was said by another Prophet, He shall sit upon the Throne of David, and over his Kingdom. You see 'tis every where over, or upon. Over Sion, upon his Seat, upon his Throne, over his Kingdom. Our Lord God therefore will give him not the typical, but the true Seat of David, not a temporal, but an eternal, not an earthly, but an heavenly one. — Farther, And he shall Reign in the House of Jacob for ever, and of his Kingdom there shall be no end. Here too, if we understand the temporal House of Jacob, how shall he Reign for ever in that which is not for ever? We must therefore seek an eternal House of Jacob, in which he may Reign for ever, of whose Kingdom there shall be no end. St. Anselm, according to this that the Word was made Flesh, he began to Reign in Believers by Faith in his Incarnation.

These in my Opinion (for I intend here to end, and think I have done pretty fair for a Letter) speak much more to purpose then those alledg'd on the other side, who talk of Christs power in general; and at most according to his humanity; but what kind of power he had they express not; the extent of his power, which no body denies, they assert very plainly, but are silent as to the quality of it, which is the thing in question: Whereas these positively declare it not to be carnal, and temporal, and earthly, but Spiritual and Divine. They tell us plainly besides what his Kingdom is: namely, the Faithful, his Church, and the plenitude of Saints now a gathering, and to be compleated in the Resurrection when he shall deliver his Kingdom to his Father. For my self, though I have enough declar'd my Opinion; yet I declare withal I mean not to tie you or any man to it. Neither do I believe those who are of a contrary judgment will be convinc'd by what I have said, neither did I go about to convince them. My business was to satisfie you, not to dogmatize. And I hope you will

will perceive your Argument so answer'd, that if those unquiet Spirits of fear and diffidence continue still to haunt you, the blame is not to be imputed to me. Of two propositions which you assum'd to fix a power Paramount in the Pope upon our Faith; I have shew'd a Catholick may safely deny either of both. 'Tis at his choice to take either way, and any one does his business. If he will deny a temporal Regality in Christ, the difficulty is cut up by the root, since a Vicar can not with any shadow of pretence challenge more then was in the Principal himself. If not willing to meddle with that question, he will take the other way, and affirm that whatever power Christ had, he left only Spiritual to *Peter* and his Successors, the difficulty is as fully cleared. A Catholick, take my word, may unreproubly hold either or both, and that you may have better security against your fears then my word can give you, I have shewed you both maintain'd by those whom Catholicks are not permitted to reprove. If all this be not enough to quiet your suspicious, let me add, that if you consider well, you will find that of all men the Principles of Catholicks can least endure the contrary Doctrine. Ask of your Fore-fathers, walk in the antient Paths, avoid novelties and the like, are *Maximes* so known and universally receiv'd amongst them, that who is known to contradict them, is known so far to swerve from the acknowledged grounds of Catholick Religion. Now when the authority of unquestionable antiquity is of the one side, and on the other, that of Authors both late and few, and of no extraordinary credit, a Catholick who knows what he does, can so little doubt which part to take, that I think he is not excusable if he so much as doubt, or at least not otherwise, then as zeal is excused by blindness. None have that veneration for antiquity, and Fathers, which Catholicks pretend, for they look upon them as the men who have begot them in the Gospel, from whence they give them the name of

Fathers, as the most considerable Pillars of the Church, as the principal Persons on whose attestation the Rule of Faith and Stability of Religion depends. After the sacred Books of Scripture written by Divine Inspiration, to which no writing of Man can be equall'd, nor so much as compar'd, we Reverence in the next place the Writings of the Fathers, which we think useful too, and the most useful of any to the understanding of the Scripture, of which we hold them the best Interpreters. We universally blame those of other Communions for preferring the obscurity of private interpretations before the clear light of Tradition. And all these things are known and acknowledg'd by every body: Wherefore since the great Lights of the Church St. *Agustin*, and St. *Hierom*, and St. *Cyrl*, and St. *John Chrysostom*, and St. *Bernard*, and the rest shine clearly out, and with a joint consent unanimously conspire into the same Doctrine, none are so blamable as Catholicks if they oppose it. And such men as *Comitolus* and *Sermarius* and the like put into the contrary ballance, weigh so little, that tis shameful even that they should enter in. The truth is, the world goes otherwise then sharp-sighted men would think it should or could; else tis not easie to conceive how it should be possible there should be found amongst those of our principles, who should stand in opposition to the Fathers. All that can be said is that worldly policy sometimes makes a little too bold with Christian simplicity, and that preposterous zeal is very blind, and therefore a very dangerous Guide. And I shall take the liberty to tell you that understanding Catholicks, who consider the way they take, see, if it were followed in other things, it would ruine Catholick Religion; and that the men indeed, perhaps by the priviledge of well meaning ignorance are Catholicks, but the way is not a Catholick way. Thanks be to God there are not many who walk in it, and those who do, I believe consider not what they do. For sure I am that knowingly to  
fleight



flight the Reverence due to Sacred Antiquity, and set up new Masters in opposition to the Fathers of Christianity and Doctors of the Church, agrees very ill with a Catholick Spirit. In fine, as men will be men, and God must make the World another thing then it is, if we expect that all should do as they ought, you will find among Catholicks some who hold the contrary Opinion, but none who hold this reprobable. And this I say the more confidently, because I mistake very much if it be reprobable even amongst the Jesuits themselves; who yet are thought the greatest Favourers of the Papal power. At least I know they cannot reprove it, without reproving their own best and most famous Authors. Read *Bellarmin. de Rom. Pontif.* the fourth Chapter of the fifth Book, and *Mal-donat.* upon 27 *Mat.* and see if they do not both expressly hold and strongly prove the Doctrine of the Fathers, and so far that the latter says people would make Christ a temporal King whether he will or no, &c. against his express declaration, and that before a Court of Justice. They are too long to be transcribed. But if you take the pains to read them, since that is safe enough from being reprov'd which there is no body to reprove; I hope your suspicions will be at quiet. However I think it but seasonable that I should, and be permitted after so long a journey to rest

*Yours, &c.*

*F I N I S.*

---

*E R R A T A.*

Page 3. line 13. read particular. l. 36. r. were. p. 7. l. 5. r. you cite. p. 8. l. 1. for be. r. his. l. 5. r. enterfere. l. 32. may, r. my. p. 10. l. 37. r. no extraordinary. p. 17. l. 29. r. the Servants ear. p. 18. l. 26. r. because be defiled. l. 33. r. yet he gave. l. 35. r. Rabanus. p. 21. l. 6. r. dogmatically. l. 9. r. any principle. l. 11. r. his side. p. 22. l. 8. r. suppose. l. 28. r. branches. p. 23. l. 22. r. Kings. p. 24. l. 16. r. penetrat. p. 27. l. 22. dele to. l. 28. r. were disposed. p. 30. l. 18. r. his answer signify d. l. ult. r. resolvedness. p. 31. l. 28. r. Creation. By.